

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No.: 10/734,920
Appellants: Muller et al.
Filing Date: December 12, 2003
Art Unit: 2154
Examiner: JOO, Joshua
Confirmation No.: 2237
Title: Body-Less Email for Asynchronous Chat-Like Communications
and Email-Chat Integration

Commissioner for Patents
Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

In response to the final Office Action, dated February 3, 2009, rejecting pending claims 1-6, 9, and 33-43, and in support of the Notice of Appeal received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on June 24, 2009, appellants hereby submit this Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Authorization is herein granted to apply the extension fees, fees for the appeal brief, and any other fees or credits due in this case to Deposit Account No. 122158. Appellants respectfully request reconsideration and reversal of the Examiner's rejections of the pending claims.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Real Party in Interest	3
Related Appeals and Interferences	3
Status of Claims	3
Status of Amendments	3
Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	4
Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	6
Argument	7-16
Claims Appendix	17-20
Evidence Appendix	21
Related Proceedings Appendix	21

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The Real Party in Interest is International Business Machines Corporation, the owner of all rights of this patent application by virtue of an assignment recorded at reel and frame number 014799 / 0606.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

None.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

The patent application as originally filed included claims 1-32. A non-final office action, dated July 26, 2007, rejected claims 1-32. A response filed October 26, 2007 cancelled claims 26-32. A final Office Action, mailed January 9, 2008, rejected all then pending claims 1-25. A response filed with an RCE on April 16, 2008 amended claims 1, 8, and 9, cancelled claims 7 and 10-25, and added claims 33-41. A non-final office action, dated July 16, 2008, rejected all then pending claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 33-41. A response to this non-final office action, filed November 17, 2008, cancelled claim 8 and added claims 42 and 43. A final office action, mailed February 3, 2009, rejected all currently pending claims 1-6, 9, and 33-43.

Accordingly, the status of the claims is:

- (a) claims 1-6, 9, 33-43 are pending in the application and are the subject of this appeal; and
- (b) claims 7, 8, 10-32 are cancelled and are not the subject of this appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the final Office Action of February 3, 2009.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1

Appellants' invention, as recited in independent claim 1, features a method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device (Fig. 3, ref. no. 50) over a network (Fig. 3, ref. no. 70). The method includes processing body-less email messages (Fig. 2, ref. no. 40) that have a subject line (Fig. 2, ref. no. 52) and lack a message body (i.e., see Fig. 1, ref. no. 26) capable of receiving message content and email messages (Fig. 1, ref. no. 10) with a message body (Fig. 1, ref. no. 26) capable of receiving message content. A synchronous communication (Fig. 6, ref. no. 180) between a first user and a second user is converted (paragraph [0033], ll. 3-6) into a body-less electronic mail message (Fig. 2, ref. no. 40, Fig. 6, ref. no. 14). The body-less electronic mail message has a subject line and lacks a message body capable of receiving message content. The subject line of the body-less electronic mail message contains at least one text message transmitted during the synchronous communication (paragraph [0033], ll. 5-6).

While the first user has the body-less electronic mail message selected (paragraph [0032], ll. 6-7), a command is received from the first user to conduct synchronous communications with the second user (paragraph [0032], ll. 4-5). In response to the command from the first user, the body-less electronic mail message is converted (paragraph [0032], ll. 7-10) into a synchronous communications format that includes each text message contained in the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message. In response to the command from the first user, synchronous communications are initiated between the first and second users to present each text message contained in the subject line of the converted body-less electronic mail message to the first and second users in the synchronous communications format (paragraph [0032], ll. 10-12).

Independent claim 42

Appellants' invention, as recited in independent claim 42, features a method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device (Fig. 3, ref. no. 50) over a network (Fig. 3, ref. no. 70). The method comprises converting a first synchronous electronic communication (Fig. 6, ref. no. 180) into a body-less electronic mail message (Fig. 2, ref. no. 40, Fig. 6, ref. no. 14). The body-less electronic mail message has a subject line (Fig. 2, ref. no. 52) and lacks a

message body (i.e., see Fig. 1, ref. no. 26) capable of receiving message content. The subject line of the body-less electronic mail message contains at least one text message transmitted during the first synchronous communication (paragraph [0033], ll. 5-6). The body-less electronic email message is received by a user over the network (paragraph [0033], ll. 8-10). In response to a command from the user, the body-less electronic mail message is automatically converted into a second synchronous electronic communication (paragraph [0032], ll. 7-10).

Independent Claim 43

Appellants' invention, as recited in independent claim 42, features a method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device (Fig. 3, ref. no. 50) over a network (Fig. 3, ref. no. 70). The method comprises converting a first body-less electronic mail message (Fig. 2, ref. no. 40, Fig. 6, ref. no 14) into a synchronous electronic communication (Fig. 6, ref. no. 180), and paragraph [0032], ll. 7-10). The first body-less electronic mail message has a subject line (Fig. 2, ref. no. 52) and lacks a message body (i.e., see Fig. 1, ref. no. 26) capable of receiving message content. The subject line of the body-less electronic mail message contains at least one text message. The synchronous electronic communication is received by a user over the network (paragraph [0032], ll. 10-12). In response to a command from the user, the synchronous electronic communication is automatically converted into a second body-less electronic mail message (paragraph [0032], ll. 7-10). The second body-less electronic mail message has a subject line containing the at least one text message of the first electronic mail message and lacks a message body capable of receiving message content (paragraph [0033], ll. 3-6).

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The final Office Action issued the following rejections:

- I. Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 33-34, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik et al. (US Publication 2004/0078448; hereafter Malik) in view of Beyda (U.S. Patent No. 7,461,378; hereafter Beyda) and further in view of Request for Comment: 2822, P. Resnick April 2001 (hereafter Resnick).
- II. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick in view of Whittle et al. (U.S. Publication 2005/0050463; hereafter Whittle).
- III. Claims 6 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick in view of Yong (U.S. Patent No. 6,963,904; hereafter, Yong).
- IV. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda and Resnick in view of Zhang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,016,478; hereafter, Zhang).
- V. Claims 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick in view of Kalfas (U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/199598; hereafter, Kalfas).
- VI. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick in view of Eason (U.S. Application Publication 2005/0039028; hereafter, Eason).

ARGUMENT

GROUND 1:

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 33-34, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik in view of Beyda and further in view of Request for Comment: 2822, P. Resnick April 2001

Independent Claim 1

As set forth in appellants' claim 1, the claimed method recites, in pertinent part, converting a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user into a body-less electronic mail message. The body-less electronic mail message has a subject line and lacks a message body capable of receiving message content. The subject line of the body-less electronic mail message contains at least one text message transmitted during the synchronous communication. In addition, the body-less electronic mail message is converted into a synchronous communications format that includes each text message contained in the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message. Thus, the appellants' invention performs conversions involving body-less email messages in two directions: from a synchronous communication to a body-less email message; and from a body-less email message to a synchronous communication format.

Malik shows a mechanism for converting email messages (but not body-less email messages) into instant message chats, yet Malik does not teach or suggest converting instant messages into email messages. The Examiner so acknowledges on page 3 of the final office action:

Malik teaches of receiving an electronic mail message but does not specifically teach of converting a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user into a body-less electronic mail message.

The Examiner thus relies on Beyda for teaching the converting of a synchronous communication (an instant message) into an electronic mail message, specifically referring to col. 6, lines 17-21. The text of col. 6, lines 17-21 of Beyda is as follows:

For example, the receiver may want to have the instant message converted into an email message and sent to an email address, specific person, Web site, etc. designated in the rule.

Beyda, however, does not describe how to convert the instant message into the email message, and, hence, is silent as to where the content of the instant message is to be placed within the email message. As Beyda does not contemplate the existence, let alone use of body-less email messages, Beyda cannot then teach or suggest converting the instant message into a body-less email message. Moreover, because Beyda does not contemplate body-less email messages, the body of the email message is as much a candidate, if not more, for receiving the content of the instant message as the subject line. Thus, any suggestion to place the content of the instant message into the subject line of the email message, instead of into the email body, does not come from Beyda.

Because neither Malik nor Beyda disclose or suggest the use of body-less email messages in their conversion processes, the Examiner relies on Resnick. Resnick describes a standard for an Internet message format. According to section 2.1 (General Description), “A message consists of header fields (collectively called “the header of the message”), followed optionally by a message body.” (Underlining added.). Thus, because the message body is optional, the Examiner argues that Resnick teaches a body-less email message.

Resnick, however, does not teach or suggest converting instant messages into email messages, and hence, provides no teaching regarding where in the email to place the content of an instant message. For email messages lacking a body, the header is all that remains, so conceivably one may argue that the content is placed in the header. However, the header is comprised of many fields including, among many others, a subject field, a comments field, a keywords field, and an optional field (pages 17-18). Because Resnick does not contemplate converting instant messages into email messages, then any suggestion to place the content of the instant message into the subject of the email message, instead of into the comments field, the keywords field, or the optional field cannot come from Resnick.

Furthermore, Resnick teaches that the subject is an optional header field (3.6.5. Informational fields). If an optional message body implies that Resnick teaches body-less email

messages, then an optional subject implies that Resnick also teaches subject-less email messages. If faced with the problem of converting instant messages into email messages, and having Resnick in front of them, one of ordinary skill in the art would be just as likely, if not more likely, to place the content of the instant message into the body of the email, rather than in the subject field – since both are optional, and both can be absent from a message, nothing in Resnick teaches or suggests that one would choose the subject field over the body.

Moreover, nothing in Resnick teaches that one is required to use a body-less email when converting instant messages to email messages – since Resnick teaches messages with a body and messages without a body, one of ordinary skill in the art, having Resnick in front of them and faced with the problem of converting instant messages into email messages, would be just as likely to choose converting the instant messages into emails with a body than into emails without a body. And the motivation proposed by the Examiner for making the combination with Resnick, namely, to “improve the suggested system by specifying a standard for transmitting messages that includes customizing of messages”, would not induce one to choose emails without a body over emails with a body. Thus, any suggestion to convert an instant message into a body-less email message, instead of into an email with a body, cannot come from Resnick.

Therefore, for the reasons provided above, none of the cited references (i.e., Malik, Beyda, or Resnick), whether taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests converting instant messages into body-less email messages. Thus, any combination of Malik, Beyda, and Resnick does not teach or suggest “converting a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user into a body-less electronic mail message”, as set forth in the appellant’s claimed invention. And even if, for the sake of argument only, the cited references can be seen to suggest converting instant messages into body-less email messages, none of the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests placing the content of the instant message into the subject line of the email message. Thus, any combination of Malik, Beyda, and Resnick does not teach or suggest that the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message “contains at least one text message transmitted during the synchronous communication”, as set forth in the appellant’s claimed invention. In view of the aforementioned arguments, appellants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Independent Claims 42 and 43

Much of the claims 42 and 43 are similar in language to the language used in method claim 1. More specifically, independent claim 42 recites “converting a first synchronous electronic communication into a body-less electronic mail message, ... the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message containing at least one text message transmitted during the first synchronous communication” and independent claim 43 recites “automatically converting, in response to a command from the user, the synchronous electronic communication into a second body-less electronic mail message, the second body-less electronic mail message having a subject line containing the at least one text message of the first electronic mail message.” Consequently, the arguments presented in connection with claim 1 are reiterated here with full force and effect. Therefore, appellants submit that claims 42 and 43 are also patentable over Malik, Beyda, and Resnick for those reasons provided in connection with claim 1, and, therefore, request withdrawal of the rejections.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 33, 34, and 41

Each of these dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and incorporates all of its limitations. Therefore, appellants submit that dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 33, 34, and 41 are allowable for the reason that they are dependent from allowable independent claim 1 and for those reasons presented in connection with independent claim 1.

In addition, each of following dependent claims recites an additional limitation that further distinguishes that claim from the combination of Malik, Beyda, and Resnick, as argued below.

Dependent Claim 3

Claim 3 depends from claim 1, and recites “wherein the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message includes one or more other text messages taken from a chat conversation converted into a format of a body-less electronic mail message.”

In the final Office Action, the Examiner states:

Malik teaches a process of copying text message from a subject of an electronic mail message into a synchronous message during

conversion of the electronic mail message into a synchronous message. During a reverse process of converting a synchronous message [into an] electronic mail message as taught by Beyda, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to reverse the process to copy a text message from the instant message to a subject of an electronic mail message.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's opinion, the appellants respectfully submit that the "reverse process" referred to by the Examiner in the rejection is neither taught nor suggested by either Malik or Beyda. Malik does not teach or suggest converting instant messages into email messages, and therefore provides no suggestion of a reverse process; whereas Beyda does not describe how to convert an instant message into an email message. Based on Beyda, the "reverse process" could just have easily been to copy the text message into the body of the email message, for Beyda does not contemplate body-less email messages. Therefore, any suggestion of a reverse process that copies the text of an instant message into the subject of an email message does not come from either Malik or Beyda. Therefore, appellants submit that claim 3 is also patentable over Malik in view of Beyda and Resnick, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Dependent Claim 5

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, and recites, in pertinent part, "displaying on the display screen a scroll bar arrow at one end of the subject line column, when a cursor is positioned over the subject column of the line item, for horizontally scrolling through the contents of the subject line."

In the final Office Action, the Examiner refers to Fig. 9 of Malik, and states that the "Window comprises a horizontal scroll bar at the end of the subject column for scrolling across the columns." Underlining added.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's opinion, the appellants respectfully submit that the "scrolling across columns" is not equivalent to "horizontally scrolling through the contents of the subject line", as set forth in the appellant's claim 5. The effect achieved by scrolling across columns simply enables the viewer to move horizontally to a column of interest; there is no scrolling through the contents of the subject column. Further unlike the appellants'

claimed invention, Malik's scroll bar is not at one end of the subject column; rather it is at the end of the DATE column or the FROM column. Malik then does not disclose these claimed features of appellants' claim 5; therefore, appellants submit that claim 5 is also patentable over Malik in view of Beyda and Resnick, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Dependent Claim 34

Claim 34 depends from claim 1, and recites, "automatically generating a body-less electronic mail message when the first user chooses to reply to or forward the received body-less electronic mail message."

In the final Office Action, the Examiner refers to paragraphs [0070] and [0087] of Malik, stating that the "User may select email reply button. Compose new email. A new email would lack content in the body." (Underlining added.) By this very comment, the Examiner acknowledges that the new email has a body, despite lacking content.

The appellants respectfully submit that lacking content in the body of an email is not the equivalent of a body-less email message. The Examiner recognizes as much by stating, "Malik does not specifically teach of processing body-less email messages that have a subject line and lack a message body capable of receiving message content." It is evident, therefore, that a new email message in Malik, although it initially lacks content in its body, still has a message body capable of receiving content. Thus, it is an email message with a body (albeit, an empty body), and not a body-less email message, as set forth in the appellants' claims. Malik then does not disclose this claimed feature of appellants' claim 34; therefore, appellants submit that claim 34 is also patentable over Malik in view of Beyda and Resnick, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

GROUND II

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda and Resnick in view of Whittle

Dependent claim 4

Dependent claim 4 depends directly from independent claim 1, and incorporates all of its limitations. Therefore, appellants submit that dependent claim 4 is allowable for the reason that is dependent from allowable independent claim 1 and for those reasons provided in connection with claim 1. Therefore, appellants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

GROUND III

Claims 6 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda and Resnick in view of Yong

Dependent claims 6, 35, and 36

Each of these dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and incorporates all of its limitations. Therefore, appellants submit that dependent claims 6, 35, and 36 are allowable for the reason that they are dependent from allowable independent claim 1 and for those reasons presented in connection with independent claim 1. Therefore, appellants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

GROUND IV

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda and Resnick in view of Zhang

Dependent Claim 37

Claim 37 depends from claim 1, and recites, “automatically signing each text message in the subject line with an identity of an author of that text message.”

In the rejection of this claim, the Examiner refers to column 7, lines 59-65 of Zhang, which states:

To allow rapid identification of scheduling messages between SK clients themselves, an identifier or “signature” is incorporated into each message by tagging the standard “subject line” in each mail message. In an exemplary embodiment, the initiator of a message (i.e., local SK client) includes the following unique identifier in the subject line of <ISK> or, alternatively, <SIS>.

Zhang immediately goes on to say in column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 9:

The interpretation of this depends on the actual type of client the recipient is. Remote recipient clients which do support the proprietary format of the local client (i.e., recipient SK remote client) can recognize the identifier and readily identify the message as a scheduling message from another SK client. This allows all SK clients to easily identify scheduling messages among themselves ... the recipient is a “smart” client with full knowledge and understanding of the type of message and how to interpret it. (Underlining added.)

Zhang, then, does incorporate a “signature” into the subject line of an email message, but as the above-underlined text illustrates, this signature does not identify an author of a text message, as set forth in the appellants’ claimed invention, but rather the type of message. Hence, notwithstanding the Examiner’s opinion, appellants respectfully submit that Zhang does not disclose this claimed feature of appellants’ claim 37. Therefore, appellants submit that claim 37 is patentable over Malik, Beyda, Resnick, and Zhang, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

GROUND 5

Claims 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda and Resnick in view of Kalfas

Dependent Claim 38

Claim 38 depends from claim 1, and recites, “presenting to a user an option to choose between generating a body-less electronic mail message and generating an electronic mail message with a message body.”

In the rejection of this claim, the Examiner refers to paragraphs [0034] and [0037] of Kalfas, and states, “User may create an email with complete message in subject, i.e., empty body.” (Underlining added.) By this comment, the Examiner acknowledges that email messages having the complete message in the subject still have a body, although it is empty.

As argued above in connection with claim 34, an email message that has no content in its body (i.e., an empty body) is not the equivalent of a body-less email message. As set forth in the appellants’ claim 1, from which claim 38 depends, a body-less email message has a subject line and lacks a message body capable of receiving message content. The email messages described by Kalfas have a message body that is capable of receiving message content, although the body is simply empty. Kalfas does not disclose or teach body-less email messages that lack a message body capable of receiving message content. Hence, Kalfas does not present to a user “an option to choose between generating a body-less electronic mail message and generating an electronic mail message with a message body”, as set forth in appellants’ claim 38. Therefore, appellants submit that claim 38 is patentable over Malik, Beyda, Resnick, and Kalfas, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

GROUND VI

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malik, Beyda and Resnick in view of Eason

Dependent Claim 39

Dependent claim 39 depends directly from independent claim 1, and incorporates all of its limitations. Therefore, appellants submit that dependent claim 39 is allowable for the reason that is dependent from allowable independent claim 1 and for those reasons provided in connection with claim 1. Appellants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments made herein, appellants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request favorable action from the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 24, 2009
Reg. No. 41,274

Tel. No.: (508) 303-0932
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/Michael A. Rodriguez/
Michael A. Rodriguez
Attorney for appellants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752

CLAIMS APPENDIX

- 1 1. A method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device over a network, the
2 method comprising:
3 processing body-less email messages that have a subject line and lack a message
4 body capable of receiving message content and email messages with a message body
5 capable of receiving message content;
6 converting a synchronous communication between a first user and a second user
7 into a body-less electronic mail message, the body-less electronic mail message having a
8 subject line and lacking a message body capable of receiving message content, the
9 subject line of the body-less electronic mail message containing at least one text message
10 transmitted during the synchronous communication;
11 receiving from the first user, while the first user has the body-less electronic mail
12 message selected, a command to conduct synchronous communications with the second
13 user;
14 converting, in response to the command from the first user, the body-less
15 electronic mail message into a synchronous communications format that includes each
16 text message contained in the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message; and
17 initiating, in response to the command from the first user, synchronous
18 communications between the first and second users to present each text message
19 contained in the subject line of the converted body-less electronic mail message to the
20 first and second users in the synchronous communications format.
- 1 2. The method of claim 1, wherein the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message
2 includes one or more other text messages taken from a subject line of a previous body-
3 less electronic mail message.
- 1 3. The method of claim 1, wherein the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message
2 includes one or more other text messages taken from a chat conversation converted into a
3 format of a body-less electronic mail message.
- 1 4. The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving the body-less electronic mail

2 message over the network, displaying the body-less electronic mail message on a display
3 screen as a line item in a mailbox view, and displaying on the display screen an entire
4 contents of the subject line when a cursor is positioned over a subject column of the line
5 item.

1 5. The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving the body-less electronic mail
2 message over the network, displaying the body-less electronic mail message on a display
3 screen as a line item in a mailbox view having a column for the subject line, and
4 displaying on the display screen a scroll bar arrow at one end of the subject line column,
5 when a cursor is positioned over the subject column of the line item, for horizontally
6 scrolling through the contents of the subject line.

1 6. The method of claim 1, further comprising inserting a delimiter into the subject line to
2 separate the text message from a previous text message currently included in the subject
3 line.

1 9. The method of claim 1, further comprising displaying on a user interface a chat-like
2 graphical window for engaging in the synchronous communications.

1 33. The method of claim 1, further comprising giving the first user an option to reply to the
2 received body-less electronic mail message with an electronic mail message having a
3 message body.

1 34. The method of claim 1, further comprising automatically generating a body-less
2 electronic mail message when the first user chooses to reply to or forward the received
3 body-less electronic mail message.

1 35. The method of claim 34, further comprising automatically placing a delineator between a
2 text message presently in the subject line of the body-less electronic mail message when
3 the first user receives the body-less electronic mail message and a text message
4 subsequently added to the subject line after the first user chooses to reply to or forward
5 the received body-less electronic mail message.

- 1 36. The method of claim 35, wherein the delineator includes a carriage return so that the text
2 message subsequently added to the subject line appears on a new line within the subject
3 line.
- 1 37. The method of claim 1, further comprising automatically signing each text message in the
2 subject line with an identity of an author of that text message.
- 1 38. The method of claim 1, further comprising presenting to a user an option to choose
2 between generating a body-less electronic mail message and generating an electronic
3 mail message with a message body.
- 1 39. The method of claim 1, further comprising preventing the first user from deleting content
2 from the subject line of the received body-less electronic mail message.
- 1 40. The method of claim 1, further comprising:
2 displaying the received body-less electronic mail message on a display screen as
3 a line item in a mailbox view; and
4 displaying an indicator in association with the line item to identify the line item as
5 a body-less electronic mail message.
- 1 41. The method of claim 1, further comprising:
2 receiving, by the first user, synchronous communications from the second user;
3 receiving, from the first user, a command to initiate asynchronous
4 communications with the second user;
5 converting, in response to the command to initiate asynchronous communications,
6 the received synchronous communications into a second body-less electronic mail
7 message; and
8 transmitting the second body-less electronic mail message to the second user over
9 the network.

- 1 42. A method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device over a network, the
2 method comprising:
3 converting a first synchronous electronic communication into a body-less
4 electronic mail message, the body-less electronic mail message having a subject line and
5 lacking a message body capable of receiving message content, the subject line of the
6 body-less electronic mail message containing at least one text message transmitted during
7 the first synchronous communication;
8 receiving the body-less electronic email message by a user over the network; and
9 automatically converting, in response to a command from the user, the body-less
10 electronic mail message into a second synchronous electronic communication.
- 1 43. A method of communicating with a user of a processor-based device over a network, the
2 method comprising:
3 converting a first body-less electronic mail message into a synchronous electronic
4 communication, the first body-less electronic mail message having a subject line and
5 lacking a message body capable of receiving message content, the subject line of the
6 body-less electronic mail message containing at least one text message;
7 receiving the synchronous electronic communication by a user over the network;
8 and
9 automatically converting, in response to a command from the user, the
10 synchronous electronic communication into a second body-less electronic mail message,
11 the second body-less electronic mail message having a subject line containing the at least
12 one text message of the first electronic mail message and lacking a message body capable
13 of receiving message content.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.